

D S

463

I48

UC-NRLF



\$B 49 721

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA


CONDEMNED
BY THE BRITISH
THEMSELVES

PRICE 6 PENCE

LONDON 1915

PUBLISHED BY THE INDIAN NATIONAL PARTY

GIFT OF



EX LIBRIS

127



BRITISH RULE IN INDIA

CONDEMNED
BY THE BRITISH
THEMSELVES

PRICE 6 PENCE

7TH EDITION.

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

LONDON 1915
PUBLISHED BY THE INDIAN NATIONAL PARTY

DS463
I48

82

ame

DEDICATED
TO THE MEMORY
OF THE INDIAN MARTYRS
WHO HAVE GIVEN UP THEIR LIVES OR
SUFFERED OTHERWISE TO AWAKEN
THEIR PEOPLE TO FREE THEMSELVES
FROM THE OPPRESSIVE
BRITISH YOKE

331806

"The government of a people by itself has a meaning and a reality, but such a thing as government of one people by another does not and cannot exist."

John Stuart Mill.

INTRODUCTION.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, India may be said to have been, to the people of Europe, an unknown land. Save to the learned who had read of its ancient fame, or to such as listened to the wonder-weaving legends that now and then made their way from the shores of the I evant, its name was a sound that woke no echo of individual hope or national solicitude. It was out of reach; it was out of sight; from the cupidity of the Occident it was safe. But distance, which had hitherto left fair Hindustan secure from European lust, seemed to lessen year by year after the Portuguese and Dutch mariners had proved that the Cape of Storms could be safely passed in ships of heavy burthen.

Gradually following the footprints of the Portuguese and the Dutch, there appeared another people on the coasts of the fabulous "Golden Chersonese", who humbly craved the permission of the rulers to squat near the seashore. They were the English at the beginning of the seventeenth century, whose King James I addressed a letter to his "illustrious brother," the Emperor of Delhi, commending them to his protecting care. Jehangir allowed them to found settlements at Surat, Cambay, and Ahmedabad, and in 1613 issued a firman (order) confirming them in these possessions. Thus the English East India Company was founded, which gradually made its way to be the paramount power in Hindustan. More than two centuries have elapsed since a few English merchants humbly solicited from the princes of Hindustan permission to traffic with their people. At present Great Britain is the sovereign power over India; but the East India Company has disappeared, and, since 1858, India has been directly under the British Crown which is represented by a Viceroy.

Thus the external form of the British Domination over India has changed, but the spirit remains the same. The British no longer figure as merchants, but all the same month by month a mercantile transaction is carried through, and India is ruled by the commercial policy of Great Britain. The whole British connection with India rests upon

the maxim that the shop-keeping element in the relations between the two countries shall be strictly maintained. India is ruled for the benefit of Great Britain and the former country is aptly called the "milch-cow" of England. Those who are acquainted with the history of the British occupation of India, know it well that England's chief motive in going to India was plunder and she has never lost sight of it. England's unbounden prosperity owes its origin to her connection with India, and it has largely been maintained—disguisedly—from the same source, from the middle of the eighteenth century up to the present time. "Possibly since the world began, no investment has ever yielded the profit reaped from the Indian plunder." And this plunder made the English industrial supremacy possible.

But what has been the result of this alien occupation of India? The world does not know much about it and the British prevent the facts being known, while they eulogise their own rule that it is

"All for love and nothing for reward."

The apologists of the British rule spare no pains in portraying the former Native rule in the blackest characters while they are in ecstasies over their own. But in discerning the true state of affairs, those who have no prejudice to warp their judgment, will come to a different conclusion. It will be evident to them that India is ruled for the benefit of the British, and the British alone. No extenuating efforts can disprove the fact that England suppresses all attempts of the Indian people to progress, no partisan spirit can deny the fact that the sources of India's fabulous "wealth" have dried up and the country is racked with perennial famines, no naked eyes can be blind to the fact that India is the most poverty-stricken country in the world. In spite of the vauntings of the British that their rule is providential and a blessing to India they stand self-condemned. Some of their politicians have made no secret of their policies in India. Thus a British-Indian statesman, Mr. William Thackeray, said: "But in India, that haughty spirit, independence, and deep thought, which the possession of great wealth sometimes gives, ought to be suppressed. They are directly adverse to our power and interest. We do not want generals, statesmen and legislators; we want industrious husbandmen." Another British statesman of greater fame, the Marquis of Salisbury, while secretary of State for India, uttered: "As India must be bled, the lancet should be directed to the parts where

the blood is congested, or at least sufficient, not to those which are already feeble for the want of it." Also another writer as early as 1792 has said: "The primary object of Great Britain, let it be acknowledged, was rather to discover what could be obtained from her Asiatic subjects, than how they could be benefited." These utterances are the true index of British policy and they clearly expose the fact that the British policy is to exploit and plunder India, which country is bleeding to death by this drainage of her wealth. The result of this drain is summed up by Mr. H. Hyndman in these pungent words: "India is becoming feebler and feebler. The very life-blood of the great multitude under our rule is slowly yet ever faster ebbing away."

To the casual visitor and the globetrotter and to those who are fed with the stories of British apologists, this part of Indian life is kept unknown, the misery and the sufferings of India are carefully hidden from their gaze and a screen is drawn between their eyes and Hindustan, which country is a "Terra incognita" to them. Because, as has been well observed by William Digby, there are two countries, situated in the land between the mountains which constitute the roof of the world and the eight degree north of the equator and bounded east and west by Chinese territory and the Afghan Kingdom. That land called India is divided into:—Anglostan, the land specially ruled by the English, in which English investments have been made, and by which a fair show and reality of prosperity are ensured, Hindusthan, practically all India fifty miles from each side of the railway lines except the tea, coffee, indigo, and jute plantations and not including the Feudatory States. Anglostan is the region to which the roseate statements in the viceregal and State Secretary's speeches refer. All that is eulogistic in Indian Welfare Blue Books apply only to Anglostan, and this land is the theme of the praises of panegyrists of the British rule in India. But behind the screen is Hindusthan, the land where over three hundred millions of people live, and what do we find there?

In that unfortunate land there is more preventable suffering, more hunger, more insufficiently clothed bodies, more stunted intellects, more wasted lives, more disappointed men. In that unhappy country, as the result of the British occupation, there is chronic famine the

appalling list of which is quoted below from the various famine commissions in their respective reports.

Famines:

1. In the last thirty years of the eighteenth century,
1769—1800..... 4 cases.
2. In the first half of the nineteenth century 1802—38... 12 cases.
3. In the second half of the nineteenth century,
1854—1908..... 35 cases.

And death from famine only during the nineteenth century is over *thirty two millions!* Mr. William Digby in his "Prosperous British India" says that the loss of life by war in all world during 107 years (1793—1900) is five millions while the loss of life by famine in India during ten years (1891—1900) is nineteen millions! While according to the calculations of some British statisticians there are ninety millions of continually hungry people in British India at the beginning of the twentieth century! The truth of this appalling misrule and misery of the people is evident to every unbiassed person. It does not require a searching enquiry to find out, that India enchained by a people who crept in the land in the darkness of her nights, and whom her magnanimity had tolerated in the days of her power, is bereft of all mental and material advancement and is lying stagnant for over a century! To India is denied all the cheerfulness of life and all the hopes and ambitions that make life worth living. As a result of this slavery life in India has lost its interestingness; as if the Indian's destiny is to be born and rot on the Indian soil! Why? Because India has been converted into a great slave-empire of Great Britain.

Thus India is a great slave-empire of England governed with a rigour more harsh and more widescoped in its appliances than the Russian despotism, for not only are the "knout" and the "pogrom" resorted to, but the people are being slowly bled to death and the land exploited by refined scientific methods. Thus England has applied three methods for the subjugation of India.

1. *Conquest by trade.*—India's trade and industry have been destroyed, all her wealth has been ruthlessly plundered, and India in all her nakedness has been made economically dependent on Great Britain which country owed her industrial supremacy to the spoliation of India.

2. *Conquest by deliberate subjection*.—All Indian aspirations and development of strong character have been suppressed. The Indian mind has been made barren of any originality, and deliberately kept in ignorance.
3. *Conquest by paralysing and stupefying* the mind of the people like drugging a person. The people are kept under an illusion in order to make them more amenable to British control. The people's character is deliberately debased, their mind is denationalized and perpetually kept in ignorance and fed with stories of England's greatness and "mission" in the world, and systematic efforts are made to obliterate the race-consciousness.

These are the methods of British Government in India. As a result the people have been made hewers of wood and drawers of water. It is not the Roman system of thoroughly Latinizing and assimilating the subject races that is tried by England, but the system of exploitation and degradation of a race by another for the material benefits of the latter. The very fact that India is shorn of all her prosperity, her wealth all drained away on account of the heavy "tribute" to England, her industries destroyed, her intellect stifled, her development stunted in every direction, the progress of over three hundred millions of people deliberately checked, is a blot on civilisation, is a crime to humanity.

Humanity is composed of various races and nationalities, and civilisation is the common heritage of all mankind. Various divisions of humanity in all ages have contributed to the development of civilisation, and India too had her quota in it. But modern India enfeathered and groaning under an unprecedented despotism cannot contribute her share, hence an enslaved India is a hindrance to the progress of universal civilisation and an era of peace.

It is a lasting shame to humanity that India's cause has been unheard, her case has been unnoticed and the world has applauded perfidious Albion. But truth is stranger than fiction, and the truth is that British rule in India is a failure, that it is a despotism of the worst type, and that India is unhappy and unfortunate under the British domination; and will the world in hearing the utterances of the Czar of Russia wonder when he said, referring to his visit to India when he was Czaro-

vitch: "Yes, the English, to do them justice, do not hide the bitter truth from themselves that India is an unfortunate country!"

Yes, India is an unfortunate country on account of its life-blood being sucked by the British vampires. The starving millions bound hand and foot are groaning under the tyrannical fetters. They ask the world to lift the veil thrown over Hindustan by hypocritical England and discover the real situation. They appeal to the conscience of the civilized world to hear their case, that British misrule has ruined India and that they want to make themselves free from the hated yoke. Their case is a just one and humanity will have to blush in shame if it does not lend its ears to the cries of three hundred millions of people. India stands at the bar of Humanity and pleads her case, she calls witnesses from the enemy's camp to substantiate her charges, for even in perfidious Albion there have been some men in every decade, though their numbers are very few, who have raised their voices in protest or confessed the truth otherwise. The damaging evidence of these men who have exposed the true nature of the British rule in India, and some of whom have dared to say that former Native rule was more conducive to the happiness of the people than British rule, is published here to prove that the British occupation of India has been a curse and Great Britain stands condemned by her own tribunal.

CHAPTER I

EVIDENCE ON THE POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE BRITISH IN INDIA

Administration of India under National Rule.

The Empire which Baber reared (in India) in the sixteenth century was long one of the most extensive and splendid in the world. In no European kingdom was so large a population subject to a single prince, or so large a revenue poured into the treasury. The beauty and magnificence of the buildings erected by the Sovereigns of Hindustan, amazed even travellers who had seen St. Peters. The innumerable retinues and gorgeous decorations which surrounded the throne of Delhi dazzled even eyes which were accustomed to the pomp of Versailles. Some of the great viceroys who held their posts by virtue of commissions from the Mogul ruled as many subjects as the King of France or the Emperor of Germany. Even the deputies of those deputies might well rank, as to extent of territory and amount of revenue with the Grand-duke of Tuscany, or the Elector of Saxony.

Lord Macaulay—Life of Clive.

I.

Marquis of Salisbury, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, on April 29, 1875.

"As India must be bled, the lancet should be directed to the parts where the blood is congested, or, at least is sufficient, not to those which are already feeble from the want of it."

II.

Lord Lytton, late Viceroy of India, in his confidential minute of 1878 addressed to the Secretary of State.
(India Act of 1833).

"No sooner was the act passed than the Government began to devise means for practically evading the fulfilment of it under the terms of the act, which are studied and laid to heart by that increasing class of educated Indians whose development the Government encourages without being able to satisfy the aspirations of its existing members, every such Indian once admitted to Government employment in posts previously reserved to the Convenanted Service, is entitled to expect and claim appointment in the fair course of promotion to the highest posts in that service. We all know that these claims and expectations *never can or will be fulfilled*. We have had to choose between prohibiting them and cheating them, and we have chosen the least straight-forward course. The application to Indians of the competitive examination system as conducted in England, and the recent reduction in the age at which candidates can compete, are all so many deliberate and transparent subterfuges for stultifying the act, and reducing it to a dead letter. Since I am writing confidentially, I don't hesitate to say that both the Government of England and of India appear to me, up to the moment, *unable to answer* satisfactorily the charges of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they have uttered to the ear."

III.

Lord Curzon, former Viceroy of India, in a speech at Jaipur in November 1902.

"There is no spectacle which finds less favour in my eyes or which I have done more to discourage than that of a cluster of Europeans settling down upon a Native State and sucking from it the moisture which ought to give sustenance to its own people."

IV.

Sir Henry Cotton, "New India," p. 116.

"Lord Curzon lost sight of the fact that what is true of the Native States is true also of the whole of India."

V.

Lord Mayo, late Viceroy of India, "Minute of the Viceroy, on military expenditure, October 3, 1870."

"A feeling of discontent and dissatisfaction exists among every class, on account of the constant increase of taxation which has for years been going on."

VI.

Marquis of Salisbury, former Prime Minister of Great Britain.

"British rule in India is the despotism of a line of kings whose reigns are limited by climatic causes to five years."

VII.

Hon. T. I. Shore, "Notes on Indian Affairs," vol. II, p. 516.

"The fundamental principle of the English had been to make the whole Indian nation subservient, in every possible way to the interests and benefits of themselves. *They have been taxed to the utmost limit*, every successive province as it has fallen into our possession, has been made field for higher exaction; and it has been our boast how greatly we have raised the revenue above that which the Indian rulers were able to extort. The Indians have been excluded from every honour, dignity, or office which the lowest English man could be prevailed upon to accept."

VIII.

Sir Edwin Arnold, "Dalhousie's Administration of British India," vol. II, p. 219.

"If those who now rule India from a first-floor in Victoria-Street will avoid the fallacy of believing the present surpluses anything like perpetual, with the present army and home establishment; if they will discard their dangerous ideas of economy at the wrong end, by starving the services and underpaying their Indian officials; if they *will truly govern India for the Indians*, and not to maintain establishments at home, it may be said that a happy as well as a new era has commenced."

IX.

Edmund Burke's speech on Fox's East India Bill
in 1783.

"But under the British Government all this order is reversed. The Tartar invasion was mischievous, but it is our protection that destroys India. It was their enmity, but it is our friendship. Our conquest there, after twenty years, is as crude as it was the first day. The Indian people scarcely know what it is to see the grey hair of an Englishman. Young men, boys almost, govern them, without society, and without sympathy to the people of India. They have no more social habits with the people than if they still resided in England; nor, indeed, any species of intercourse but that which is necessary to making a sudden fortune, with a view to a remote settlement. Animated with all the avarice of age, and all the impetuosity of youth, they roll in one after another, wave after wave, and there is nothing before the eyes of the Indian people but an endless, hopeless prospect of new flights of birds of prey and passage, with appetites continually reviewing for a food that is continually wasting. Every rupee of profit made by an Englishman is lost for ever to India."

X.

R. B. Sheridan, "Speech on the Begums of Oude,"
February 7, 1787.

"It has been said of the Company that there was something in their operations which combined the meanness of a pedlar with the profligacy of a pirate. . . . Thus it was they united the mock majesty of a bloody sceptre and the little traffic of a merchant's counting-house, wielding a truncheon with one hand, and picking a pocket with the other."

XI.

Lord Clive's letter to the Court of Directors from
Calcutta, dated 30th September 1765.

"The sources of tyranny and oppression, which have been opened by the European agents acting under the authority of the Company's servants, and the numberless agents and sub-agents acting also under them, will, I fear, be a lasting reproach to the English name in this country."

XII.

Governor Harry Verelst, in a letter to the Director
of East India Company, Letter dated 5th April 1769.

"It will hardly be asserted that any country, however opulent, could long maintain itself, much less flourish, when it received much

less material supplies, and when a balance against it, of above one-third of its whole yearly values, was yearly incurred.

"Besides this there are other concomitant circumstances, which have contributed to diminish the riches of the country, and must, if not remedied, soon exhaust them. I have observed that one great advantage the country formerly reaped was the diffusion of its revenues by large grants to different families, and by the expensive luxuries of its governors. But now the whole amount of the lands is swallowed up in one gulp—your treasury; nor does any part of it return into circulation, except the sum issued from our investment and necessary expenses."

XIII.

Sir Thomas Munro, his "Life," vol. III.

"The native governments had a class of richer gentry, composed of Jagheardars and Emendars, and of all the higher civil and military offices. These, with the principal merchants and ryots, formed a large body, wealthy, or at least easy in their circumstances. . . . These advantages have almost entirely ceased under our government. All the civil and military offices of any importance are now held by Europeans, whose savings go to their own country. And yet while pursuing a system, the tendency of which is to lower the character of a whole people, we profess to be extremely anxious to improve that character by education."

XIV.

Sir Henry Cotton, "New India," p. 118.

"Another source of impoverishment is the artificial exchange which has been established in the Indian currency. While the silver value of the rupee remains at about ten pence, its artificial value has been fixed at a convertibility of one shilling and four pence into gold. At the same time the purchasing power of the rupee has declined. . . . The Government has profited immensely by the artificial raising of the rupee; the officials who draw their salaries in silver have also profited; but on the other hand the bulk of the people and all classes of producers are injuriously affected by this cause."

XV.

ib., pp. 113—115.

"The increasing poverty of India is due to many causes, but primarily I trace it to the decay of handicrafts and the substitution of foreign for home manufactures. . . . A further cause of the impoverishment

of India is the *drain* from the country. . . . The home charges increase year by year. . . . Taking everything into consideration, it is a moderate computation that the annual drafts from India to Great Britain amount to a total of thirty millions. It can never be to the advantage of the people of India to remit annually this enormous sum to a foreign country."

XVI.

Minute of Lord Teignmouth, dated 18th June 1789
 "Respecting the Permanent Settlement of the land-
 in the Bengal Provinces," published in fifth Re-
 port, 1812, pp. 169—238. Paragraphs 131—140.

"The company are merchants as well as sovereigns of the country. In the former capacity they engross its trade, whilst in the latter they appropriate the revenues. The remittance to Europe of revenues are made in the commodities of the country which are purchased by them.

"Whatever allowance we may make for the increased industry of the subjects of the state, owing to the enhanced demand for the produce of it (supposing the demand to be enhanced), there is reason to conclude that the benefits are more than counterbalanced by evils inseparable from the system of the remote foreign dominion.

"Every information from the time of Bernier to the acquisition of the Dewani shows the internal trade of the country, to have been very considerable. . . . But from the year 1765 (after the foundation of English domination) the reverse has taken place. The company's trade produces no equivalent returns.

"Upon the whole, I have no hesitation in concluding that since the company's acquisition of the Dewani the current specie of the country has been greatly diminished in quantity, that the old channels of importation by which the drains were formerly replenished are now in great measure closed, and that the necessity of supplying China, Madras and Bombay with money, as well as the *exportation of it by Europeans to England*, will continue still further to exhaust the country of its silver."

XVII.

John Bright, "Debate on the Indian Budget,"
 August 1, 1859.

"The question assumes every year a greater magnitude and a greater peril. We have what we have had for twenty years—deficit on deficit, and debt on debt. Some day or other it will find us out, or we shall find it out. . . . What we are now meeting is the natural and inevitable consequence of the folly we have committed."

XVIII.

John Bright, "Debates in Parliament on the India Question in 1853."

"While Government had overthrown almost entirely the native education that had subsisted throughout the country so universally, that a schoolmaster was so regular a feature in every village as the 'Patil,' or headman, it had done next to nothing to supply the deficiency which had been created, or to substitute a better system."

XIX.

John Sullivan, in evidence before the Parliament.
"Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee," 1832, vol. I, pp. 65-66.

Q. 503. "What are the disadvantages under which the people of India at present feel themselves to labour with respect to the British Government?"

A. "Their exclusion from all offices of trust and emolument and from that position in the administration of the country, civil and military which they occupied under their own princes."

Q. 509. "Does not the system which the Indian people have always enjoyed under the British Government compensate to them in a large degree if not entirely for their loss of the exclusive possession of offices, to which under the native Government they considered themselves to be entitled?"

A. "I should say that nothing can compensate them under such exclusion."

XX.

Sir William Hunter.

"It may seem a contradiction in terms to say that the English who pay at the rate of forty shillings per head to the Imperial Exchequer, besides many local burdens, are more lightly taxed than the Indians who pay only at the rate of three shillings and eight pence to the Imperial Exchequer, with scarcely any local burdens. But the sum of forty shillings per head bears a much smaller proportion to the margin between the national earnings and the national requirements for subsistence in England than the sum of three shillings and eight pence bears to that margin in India. In estimating the revenue-yielding powers of India, we must get rid of the delusive influence which hundreds of millions of taxpayers exercise upon the imagination. We must think less of the numbers and more of the poverty of the Indian people."

XXI.

Sir Walter Strickland, "The Black Spot in the East."
Preface.

"During two years the writer has lived almost exclusively with Asiatics and Eurasians, in Ceylon, the Straits Settlements and Southern India; but the experiences thus gained has not diminished the conviction, that British greed and misrule in the East are the prime factors of British Empire there, deliberately applied in order to ruin the peoples they pretend to benefit."

XXII.

Ib., p. 4. ✓

"— — But think of the millions of pound sterling that would have been saved, for there would have been no mutiny, as that glorious and patriotic attempt of the great and good Nana Saheb has been mis-called by the English, to extirpate a horde of avaricious vampires, whose continuous presence in Hindoostan is now realized by all thoughtful and well-informed persons to have been the greatest disaster that ever afflicted the country."

XXIII.

Ib., p. 35.

"The English Empire is like the Phœnician one. It consists of a host of projectors and squatters, who overrun the lands of other people, not in order to develop their agriculture for the advantage of the people themselves, but to steal their precious metals; and so wherever these commercial brigands betake themselves the same phenomena occur.

"Where the English can carry out this system, the native populations gradually decline in prosperity or die out."

XXIV.

Ib., p. 35.

"Let the English at home who read these lines reflect that, when they sip their deleterious decoctions of tannin, their cheap Ceylon teas, they too, in their degree are devourers as well of human flesh and blood. It is not the tea alone, but the impoverished blood of the slaves, denuded of its red seeds of life and vigour, that they are drinking. Were there justice in heaven, every drop they drink should be a poison to sap the virility of their race and reduce it to degenerate and harmless impotency."

XXV.

Ib., p. 52.

“We have also already seen that part of the failure of the English to render races in tropical countries populous, prosperous, and happy, is due to the fact that, being primarily a commercial and industrial people, they go to tropical countries to rob them of raw material and not to develop native races and native agriculture.

XXVI.

Ib., p. 61.

“To the English, where wholesale massacre is not possible, to emasculate a whole people seems to bring a sour joy in the doing of it, such as priests and the less noble of the Roman Emperors revel and have always revelled in. Strange perversity of the Anglo-Christian mind, to which purity consists in staunching the sources of continuous earthly being, and bringing to nought the bounteous power of the God they feign the creator of it. To change something and to destroy something, that is the ideal of progress of the normal English mind; we shall soon see how disastrously it works when the English set off on their missions of mercy and loving kindness, with their tongues in their cheeks and their convenient masks and wolf's clothing on, as “benefactors of the world at large,” that they may the more readily impose themselves upon the peoples they have marked out for spoliation and ruin.”

XXVII.

Ib., p. 62.

“Whenever I have been in a position to see the British empire at work and study it at all close quarters, the margin beyond a camorra of hypocritical liars, thieves, and murderers has been always more or less microscopic; often, indeed, quite imperceptible.”

XXVIII.

Holt Mackenzie, his minute in the report of the select committee of the parliament in 1833, para 67.

“... Since the world began, there is probably no example of a Government carrying the principle of absolutism so completely through the civil administration of the country if that can be called civil which is in its spirit so military; nay, which sets the people aside in the management of their own concerns much more than the Sepoy in the Government of the army. The principle pervades every act, from the

highest exercise of legislative power to the appointment of the meanest public officer. . . . It seems to be vain to think that we can by any legislative provision secure the community from extortion and vexation, if we once allow or require the Government officers to interfere perpetually in the minute details of the peoples' business. We have unfortunately acted on an opposite principle, interfering in almost every thing, neglecting popular institutions where they exist, and never attempting to create them when wanting."

XXIX.

John Sullivan, "A Plea for the Princes of India,"
p. 28.

"It is the settled purpose of the British Government to extirpate the ancient aristocracy from the land—an aristocracy in comparison with which, in point of antiquity, every family in England is modern; and as, by the laws of equal inheritance, there can be no permanent accumulation of landed property in the hands of individuals—to reduce India to a state, in which the Governor-general shall represent the Sovereign, the English officials the aristocracy, and the hundreds of millions of people be reduced to the condition of the "lower orders." The object of this fearful resolution is avowedly, *money*, and this object is to be attained by trampling upon treaties which, as Lord Auckland said, "speak a language which cannot be mistaken."

XXX.

Ib., pp. 57—58.

"We have seen, from the examples of the annexation of Scinde, Sattara, and the Punjab, that while Revenue is the professed object, debt is the sure consequence of these spoliations; and it is upon the people of India that this debt falls. It is the British Government which has entailed upon the people of India a national debt—as to make it necessary for us to fasten upon the people many most objectionable taxes."

XXXI.

Robert Rickards in evidence before Committee on
"East India Company's affairs," 1831. Report of
Committee, vol. V, Answers to Questions 2795—2797.

"But I still maintain that any improvement which may have arisen in consequence of the introduction of British capital and British

enterprise into India, is nothing in comparison with what would be the case if the people of India were sufficiently encouraged, and proper attention paid to their cultivation and improvement."

XXXII.

Ib.

"I have already observed, that the improvements introduced by Europeans are limited in comparison with what might be the case if the people of India were sufficiently encouraged, but in their present state of extreme poverty and almost slavery, it is not reasonable to expect that any great improvements can flow from them. One of the greatest improvements, however, of which the mind of man is susceptible, have been made by the Indian people from their own exclusive exertions. Their acquirement of knowledge is quite astonishing."

XXXIII.

Ib., Answer to Question 2825.

"Where the revenue is collected as it is in India, on the principle of the Government being entitled to one half of the gross produce of the soil, and vast numbers of officers, whose acts it is impossible to control, are also employed in the realization of the revenue, it is a moral impossibility for any people whatever to live, or prosper, so as to admit of a very extensive commercial intercourse being carried on with them."

XXXIV.

Ib., Answer to Question 2827.

"It is anything but a moderate tax, for I have shown in the above mentioned work, it is in all cases exorbitant; and strange to say, in some instances even exceeds the gross produce of the lands or plantations on which it is."

XXXV.

Ib., Answer to Question 2928.

"You have stated that the tax is equal in some cases to the produce of the land; has land then a saleable value in any part of India where the taxes take away the whole of this produce?—I am personally acquainted with instances where the *revenue assessed upon certain lands has actually exceeded the gross produce*. I have also known other lands in India where a revenue has been assessed as being specifically derivable

from rice lands, plantations of fruit trees, pepper, vines, and other articles, and each portion particularly described; but on comparing the assessment with the lands in question those very lands have been found to have been nothing but jungle within the memory of man. Land, however, has a saleable value in those parts of India where our revenue systems admit of some rent being derived from the land by the land-holder or proprietor; but when the whole rent is absorbed by the Government tax on revenue, the land is of course destitute of saleable value."

XXXVI.

lb., Question 2840 and Answer.

"Under such a system of judicature, police, and taxation as you have described, what prospect do you think there is of the inhabitants of British India becoming either a wealthy, a prosperous, or a commercial people?—*None whatever*; our local institutions, including the revenue system, must be greatly altered or modified before the Indian people can become wealthy or prosperous; if the conditions of the Indian people, their habits, their wants, their rights and their interests were properly attended to, all the rest would follow as a matter of course."

XXXVII.

C. J. O'Donnell, "The Failure of Lord Curzon,"
p. 16.

"Taxation, rendered necessary by the same 'Imperialist' furor that now exists in England, over-taxation of the most grinding kind, is eating out the life of the Indian races, and surely preparing for the English nation one of the most heart-rending problems ever offered to man for solution, viz, the government of hundreds of millions of people always on the brink of starvation."

XXXVIII.

lb., p. 21.

"The dominions of the Mahratta sovereign passed under British rule in 1817, the then land revenue was 80 lakhs of rupees (a lakh being 100,000). The following year it was raised to 115 lakhs, and in 1823 to 150 lakhs, already nearly double the native assessment of six years before! . . . Writing nearly seventy years later, the government of Bombay in its Administration report for 1892-93, page 76, gave the following description: 'Every effort was made—lawful and unlawful—to get the utmost out of the wretched peasantry, who were

subjected to torture—in some instances cruel and revolting beyond description—if they could not or would not yield what was demanded. Numbers abandoned their homes, and fled into neighbouring Native States; large tracts of land were thrown out of cultivation, and in some districts no more than a third of the cultured area remained in occupation.”

XXXIX.

The “Pioneer,” the semi-official paper of British-Indian government in an article in 1877.

“Worried by the revenue survey, for heavily enhanced public payments, . . . the Deccan ryot (peasant) accepted, for the third of a century, the yoke of *British misgovernment* . . . Report upon report had been written upon him; shelf upon shelf in the public offices groaned under the story of his wrongs. If any one doubts the naked accuracy of these words, let him dip into the pages of Appendix A (Papers on the Indebtedness of the Agricultural Classes in Bombay). *A more damning indictment was never recorded against a civilized government . . .*”

XL.

Bishop Heber writing to Right Hon. C. W. Wynn, in a letter dated Karnatik, March 1826.

“In Hindusthan, I found a general feeling among the king’s officers, and I myself was led, from some circumstances, to agree with them, that the peasantry in the company’s provinces are, on the whole, worse off, poorer, and more dispirited, than the subjects of the Indian princes. . . . The fact is, *no Indian prince demands the rent which we do*. . . . I met with very few public men who will not, in confidence, own their belief that the people are over-taxed, and that the country is in a gradual state of impoverishment. The collectors do not like to make this avowal officially. . . . In general, all gloomy pictures are avoided by them as reflecting on themselves, and drawing on them censure from the secretaries at Madras or Calcutta.

“I have sometimes wished that its immediate management were transferred to the crown. But what I saw in Ceylon makes me think this a doubtful remedy, unless the government and above all, the people of England, were convinced that no country can bear to pay so large a revenue to foreigners, as those who spend their wealth within their own borders.”

XLI.

W. W. Blunt, "India under Ripon," p. 6.

"Neither Strachey nor Lytton had been able to convince me that the immense poverty of the agricultural peasantry was not connected with our extravagant English administration. This last, Lytton, in his lighter moods, was fond of describing as 'a despotism of office boxes tempered by an occasional loss of keys.'"

XLII.

M. Frederic Harrison, "National and Social Problems," p. 252.

"By enforcing prematurely a system of contract and foreign law on the Indian peasantry, they are being pauperized and ruined."

XLIII.

William Digby, "India for the Indians—and for England," p. 132.

"The viceroy (Dalhousie) compelled the Nizam to assign his most valuable provinces as security for a debt which, it is doubtful, really existed. . . . The average Englishman, strong in his belief as to the honesty of British administrations, would scarcely believe unless chapter and verse were given, and hardly even then, that such things could be done as were done when the Berars were acquired by Lord Dalhousie . . . yet the wrong was done, the wrong is still unredressed."

XLIV.

ib., p. 165.

"Lord Dalhousie wrested from the Nizam the fairest and the most prosperous districts of his dominions, to support a contingent the existence of which, a few years before, even Lord Dalhousie himself had declared he could not defend. The act was high handed and unjustifiable."

XLV.

ib., p. 165.

On one occasion when the Nizam asked why the contingent was kept longer than the proceedings of the Hindu princes threatened war, the reason given for creating it, Lord Dalhousie wrote: - 'I for my part, can never consent, as an honest man to instruct the Resident

to reply that the contingent has been maintained by the Nizam from the end of the war 1817 until now because the 12th article of the treaty of 1800 obliged His Highness so to maintain it."

XLVI.

Horace Hyndman, "The Bankruptcy of India,"
p. 40.

"We attribute all suffering under native governments to native misrule; our own errors we father on 'nature.' It was the mission of the arbitrary bigot (Lord Dalhousie) to shock every native idea of justice or good faith, to commence that course of unscrupulous annexation and wholesale Europeanization from which our Empire is now suffering.

"The truth is that Indian society as a whole, has been frightfully impoverished under our rule, and that the process is going on now at increasingly rapid rate.

"The famines which have been devastating India are in the main financial famines. Men and women cannot get food because they have not been able to save the money to buy it."

XLVII.

Horace Hayman Wilson, "History of India."

Ymp
LX
"It was stated in evidence (1813) that the cotton and silk goods of India up to that period could be sold for a profit in the British market at a price from 50 to 60 per cent lower than those fabricated in England. It consequently became necessary to protect the latter by duties of 70 and 80 per cent, on their value, or by positive prohibition. Had this not been the case, had not such prohibitory duties and decrees existed, the mills of Paisley and Manchester would have been stopped in their outset, and could scarcely have been again set in motion, even by the power of steam. They were created by the sacrifice of Indian manufacturers. Had India been independent, she would have retaliated, would have imposed prohibitive duties upon British goods, and would thus have preserved her own productive industry from annihilation. This act of self-defence was not permitted her; she was at the mercy of the stranger. British goods were forced upon her without paying any duty, and the foreign manufacturer employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms. *It is a painful episode in the history of British India.*"

XLVIII.

W. S. Blunt, "India under Lord Ripon," p. 235.

"The suppression of free thought and speech in India, by the new press laws and the revival of arbitrary arrest and imprisonment without trial, is a subject I cannot let pass without a protest. Such methods of government are not only repugnant to me, but are, I am sure, as futile as they are reactionary. If persisted in, they can only mean that the government relying on them has no serious intention of true progressive reform."

XLIX.

William Digby, "India for the Indians—and for England," p. 255.

"The English people have not been suckled and brought up on the Evangelical creed of Christendom in vain. The central feature of the evangelical creed is embodied in the sentences: 'without shedding of blood there is no remission.' It matters not in what direction the eye is turned. This doctrine finds full exemplification. 'Without shedding of blood' runs like a scarlet thread through every department of our national existence: it marks every work we undertake and marks much that otherwise might be wholly beneficial.

"In India we are exaggerating this national and Christian characteristic. Even with 'shedding of blood' there is no remission. Not wholly for want of will does this lamentable state of things exist: efforts are made, but they run on old lines wherein the benefit proves for the foreigner and not for the Indian. An insurance fund against famine at one and a half million a year is added to the taxation of the country. First, it is pounced upon to pay a portion of the expenses of a needless war in Afghanistan. Then, it is determined to expend the sum year by year upon railways and other means of communication: as though ironclads were, in a poverty-stricken and steadily drained country, panaceas of famine, and as though the most disastrous famine of the century had not, within our immediate recollection, occurred in provinces fairly well supplied with railways. We take the people's money to preserve them from famine, and all of it, except the mere cost of labour, is expended in England for supervision, for iron or steel railways, for engines and coaches; even the English investor finds an outlet secured for his surplus cash—in a guaranteed loan in many cases: where the loan is not guaranteed, the reason is because there is a moral certainty of the projected line paying a dividend better than is received from English consols. That is taking one shilling from the

Indian people, and spending the larger proportion, say eight pence for the profit of the English manufacturer and investor. Under such a system, and in spite of the multiplication of railways, famines will increase in the land, the last state of the unfortunate people will be worse than the first, and the tale of blood exacted more and more fearful."

L.

ib., pp. 258-59.

“The long and dismal record of British prosperity heightened at the expense of daily increasing poverty to more millions in India than the British Isles contain, will continue. Some day, however, a catastrophe more terrible than ought yet experienced, will occur. What form it will take no man can positively tell. . . The English people will learn by one way only. They would not displace the company of merchants from supreme rule in India until there had been a frightful mutiny due to misgovernment: In like manner the reform for which India is ripe, which our experience in that country has shown to be above and beyond all things necessary, . . . but it will not come until a great shedding of blood procures remission.”

LI.

A Manifesto of the Executive Council of the Social-democratic Party of Great Britain in "Justice,"
August 27, 1910.

“British tyranny in India is rapidly going from bad to worse. Our liberal and radical Government arrests patriots without accusation and deports them without trial, outrages the right of asylum, and denies political prisoners the right of defence by counsel, suborns perjured witnesses, and defends the torture of innocent people by its police, puts down public meetings, and suppresses freedom of the press. All the infamies, which have been properly denounced by members of our present cabinet when committed by Russia and elsewhere, are being perpetrated in Hindusthan by Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, Lord Morley, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Winston Churchill and their fellow-ministers, without any effective protest having been made in the House of Commons or in the country. We have broken pledge after pledge to give fair treatment to India. *India has been steadily impoverished for five generations by British robbery and extortion.* The amount of wealth drained from India year by year without return greatly exceeds the total gross amount of the rack-rented land revenue. English Home charges, and interest on

money lent back to India after having been pumped out of the stomachs of the starving peasants, have rendered famine permanent throughout vast regions where formerly dearth and distress came but fitfully."

LII.

H. M. Hyndman, "Bankruptcy of India," p. 74.

"... That the people of India are growing poorer and poorer; that taxation is not only actually but relatively far heavier, that each successive scarcity widens the area of impoverishment, and renders famines more frequent; that most of the trade is but an index to the poverty and crushing over-taxation of the people; that a high organized foreign rule constitutes by itself a most terrible drain upon the country."

LIII.

Rev. J. T. Sunderland (an Englishman), "New England," Magazine for September 1900 Vol. XXIII, No. 1.

"The fact that at the end of two hundred years of commercial dominance and of more than forty years of absolute political sway, we are confronted with such indescribable poverty of the people, and with famine after famine of such magnitude and severity as to make the world stand aghast, seems to prove beyond answer that England in all these years has not made the welfare of India her first aim, but has subordinated India's good to her own enrichment. We denounce ancient Rome for impoverishing Gaul and Egypt and Sicily and Palestine and her other conquered provinces by draining away her wealth to enrich herself. We denounce Spain for robbing the New World in the same way. But England is doing exactly the same thing in India, and on a much larger scale; only she is doing it skilfully, adroitly, by modern and 'enlightened' modes of procedure, under business and judicial forms, and with so many pretences of 'governing India for her advantage, and enriching her by civilized methods' that the world has been largely blinded to what has been really going on."

LIV.

J. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P., "The Awakening of India," pp. 142-43.

"The heaviest obligations of the people are to the Government, and the weight of taxation is blamed for the poverty of the people. We take in land revenue £20,000,000 per annum, £3,000,000 from

salt, £11,000,000 from customs and excise, and have a net income of a little under £50,000,000 and a gross one of over £70,000,000. On the other side of the account we spend on army and military works, not including strategic (*sic*) railways, a sum which is just short of £20,000,000; it costs £6,000,000 to collect the revenue, and we spend about £19,000,000 in England, not including the cost of stores for Railway and Irrigation works.

The revenue works out at a tax of 3s 6³/₄d per head of the population. This seems small, particularly when it is remembered that is 8d of the sum comes from the land revenue, which is not a tax but a rent. We must not be misled into an unwarrantable optimism, however by these figures. For the burden of taxation is measured not by its absolute amount, but by its ratio to income. For instance, our burden at home is about £3 per head; our income £40 per head. The burden upon the British Indian is 3s 6³/₄d per head—or, deducting the land revenue, is 10²/₃d per head—whilst his average annual income is not more than £2!"

LV.

Ib., pp. 145—48.

"It is unspeakably mean of us to place this burden on the Indian's back simply because he must bear any load we put upon him. Nine-tenths of the charge of the army in India is an Imperial charge. Canada, South-Africa, and Australia should bear it as much as India. It is a piece of the most bitter cynicism to find the Imperial doors of our colonies shut in the faces of these poor people, who bear such an inordinate share of the cost of Imperial maintenance, and at whose expense these dominions are protected from the fear of war. If £18,000,000 of the army charges were met by the whole Empire, we might look the Indian taxpayer in the face as honest men. . . .

"On the other hand, a little over a million and a half pounds spent on education is ridiculous! The small state of Baroda, with a population of 2,000,000 souls, spends £660,000 on this, and has committed itself to a policy which will soon cost £1,000,000 per annum. In Baroda, education has been compulsory since 1904—5; while 90 per cent of the males and 99 per cent of the females in British India are illiterate!

"Our expenditure on education, however, is only typical. We spend far too much of the income of India on Imperial purposes and far too little on Indian development.

"On the whole, I think two charges can be substantiated against us. Our Government is extravagant, and *we have behaved meanly to India*. We charge the Indian tax-payer with the cost of the India office in Whitehall—even with the cost of building it: we would never think

of making such a charge against our colonies; India has to pay for Aden—and for Imperial embassies into different parts of Asia; but the depth of meanness was surely touched when we tried to charge India with £7,000, the cost of the representatives and guests from India who took part in the coronation ceremonies of the late king."

"A mere recital of recent famine statistics is enough to appall one."

LVI.

Ib., p. 163.

"In studying famine, one must begin by grasping what it is and how it presents itself. Even in the worst times now there is no scarcity of grain in the famine-stricken districts. At the very worst time in the Guzerat famine of 1900, it was shown by the official returns that there was 'sufficient grain to last for a couple of years in the hands of the grain-dealers of the district. It is, therefore, not a scarcity of grain that causes famines.' In recent time famine has been caused by a destruction of capital and the consequent cessation of the demand for labour. High prices coincide with low wages and unemployment, and people starve in the midst of plenty."

LVII.

Ib., p. 178.

"That the general conclusion to which I have come... is that economic rent is increasing; that the aristocracy and members of the old trading and middle class are being reduced; that the cultivator is being divided, and at one end is becoming better to do, at the other worse off; that the industrial population... is gradually drifting into the same position as the European industrial population.

"Thus, the great transformation deliberately desired and striven for by the western minds who have been squeezing India into western moulds comes upon India—certainly not for its final benefit."

LVIII.

R. H. Davies, the officiating commissioner of Central India. "A Debate in the House of Commons,"
May 1867.

In a debate on the Mysore Succession, which arose in the House of Commons in May 1867, the Marquis of Salisbury (then Lord Cranborne, M.P.) instituted a comparison between the British and Indian systems of government in India, and pointed out certain inherent

defects in the former. The officiating commissioner of Central India, Mr. R. H. Davies, fairly summed up the argument thus:—

“A number of small well-governed states in India, would be more conducive to the political and moral advancement of the people than the present British Government, because—

1. The rudeness and simplicity of Native Administration, though intolerable in Europe, have a rough and ready efficiency well calculated for dealing with great emergencies, such as famine;
2. and have a fitness and geniality in the eyes of the people which compensate for any material evil which may co-exist;
3. migrations of people from Native States to British territory are unheard of, while the contrary case is common; and
4. owing to listlessness, heavy-headedness, and extreme centralization, the British Government is, in a considerable degree, inefficient, and occasionally productive of terrible misery, as, for instance, the Orissa famine.”

LIX.

Sir Richard Temple's Communication in reply to Mr. Wyllie's circular of 1867 who at the request of the Governor-general tried to gather data to answer Marquis of Salisbury's assertion.

Sir, “In 1850, I was employed in the Allahabad district, on the frontier of the Rajah of Rewah. In that tract, at that time *our rule was not more popular than that of the Rajah.*

“From 1863 to 1867 I have been acquainted with the British districts on the frontiers of the Native States of Bundelkhand, of Sindhia, and Bhopal, *and have never observed that the people preferred our management over that of the Native States.* Indeed several tracts in that quarter *had been unsuccessfully managed by the British.*

“I have recently observed evidence in the old Hyderabad records, that after 1819, when the Peshwah's Dominions in the Deccan were brought under British rule, our revenue settlements were in some districts not successful, and did not compare favourably with some of the Nizam's districts.

“In 1864, I passed through the Baroda territory and the Gaekwar's Dominions, certainly that district, the valley of the Mhye, is in external prosperity hardly surpassed by any British district that I have ever seen at least.”

LX.

Political Report on the "State of Rampur under Native Rule," 1832 pp. 36—37.

"If the comparison for the same territory be made between the management of the Rohillas and that of our own Government, *it is powerful to think that the balance of advantage is clearly in favour of the former.*"

LXI.

Ib., Report from the Commissioners.

"While the surrounding country seemed to have been visited by a desolating calamity, the lands of the Rajahs Diaram and Bagwant Singh under every disadvantage of season, were covered with crops produced by a better husbandry, or by greater labour, it should here be explained, that the neighbouring lands alluded to in the report consisted of British territory, already five years in our occupation."

LXII.

Sir George Campbell, K. C. S. I., M.P. in one of his official reports as Lieutenant-governor of Bengal, quoted in his book, "The ruin of an Indian Province. An Indian famine explained." 1880.

"The result of Mr. Kemble's inquiries on the Nepal frontier is discouraging, in that, after very fairly weighing the respective advantages and disadvantages of both, he comes to the conclusion that the condition of the Nepal ryot (peasant) is on the whole better than that of the British ryot."

LXIII.

Bishop Heber, writing to the Right Hon. Charles W. Wynn in England, in a letter dated Carnatik, March 1826, quoted from Bishop Heber's memoirs and correspondence by his widow, vol. II.

"But there is one point which, the more I have seen of India, since I left Bengal for the first time, has more and more impressed itself on my mind. Neither Indian nor European agriculturist, I think, can thrive at the present rate of taxation. . . . *it is an effectual bar to everything like improvement*; it keeps the people, even in favourable years in a state of abject penury. . . . the peasantry in the Company's provinces are worse off, poorer and more dispirited than the subjects of the Indian princes."

LXIV.

John Malcolm Ludlow, "British India," vol. II,
p. 330.

"Can we resist the conclusion that . . . the condition of British India, as a whole, is the reverse of thriving—actually deteriorating? . . . Can we resist the conclusion that the most common vice of the Indian people is one which spreads and grows with the breadth and duration of our rule?"

LXV.

"Friend of India" (an English journal), 1851.

"In the two provinces of Bengal and Behar which have been longest in our possession, and which have yielded the largest amount of revenue—for one good road which we have constructed, *we have allowed twenty others to disappear*. We have erected one magnificent city, and *every other city of note has been allowed to go to ruin*."

LXVI.

W. Chaplin, Collector in Madras, and Commissioner in the Deccan in evidence, at the inquiry of 1831 as to Indian fitness for official positions in India.

Q 5301. "I am afraid that the nature of our government is not calculated for much improvement. The nature of our government is on fact, *adverse to improvement*."

LXVII.

Sir Walter Strickland in "The Indian Sociologist,"
September 1912.

"In the last ten years from 1896 to 1906, the English have allowed some fifteen millions of the inhabitants of India—that is a good deal more than a twentieth of the whole population—to be sacrificed to plague and famine alone.

"... Bishop Heber is said to have realised towards the end of his life what British misrule in India really meant;—one would have thought that the appalling state of things brought about by the greed and incompetence of the English in India would have shocked and appalled even the most loathsome ghou, glutted with human flesh and blood that even the English would have felt some slight regret and uneasiness

at the frightful results of their handiwork; but so far from this being the case, incredible as it may appear, so intense is the passion for death and destruction among this people, that the terrific death-rate among the serfs is actually a source of satisfaction and complacent pride to this horrible *danse macabre* that calls itself English and the paramount power."

LXVIII.

Rev. J. T. Sunderland (an Englishman) in the "New England magazine" for September 1900, vol. XXIII, No. 1.

"Again and again attention has been called to the effects of the heavy and constant drain of wealth from India to England... This drain from India has been going on and steadily increasing for more than two centuries. There is no country in the world that could endure such a steady loss of wealth without becoming impoverished."

LXIX.

John Sullivan, "A Plea for the Princes of India," p. 67.

"Upon extermination of a Native State, the Englishman takes the place of the sovereign, under the name of commissioner; three or four of his associates displace as many dozen of the Indian official aristocracy; while some hundreds of our troops take the place of the many thousands that every Indian chief supports. The little Court disappears—trade languishes—the capital decays—the people are impoverished—the Englishman flourishes, and acts like a sponge, drawing up riches from the banks of the Ganges, and squeezing them down upon the banks of the Thames."

LXX.

John Malcolm Ludlow, "British India," vol. II, p. 335.

"The present system of Indian Government—cumbrous, wasteful inefficient, and dishonest as a piece of administrative machinery—has failed in practice in every one of the requisites of good Government."

LXXI.

J. S. Mill, "History of India," vol. III, p. 316.

"English despotism is the cause of Indian crimes. The Penal Law set up by the English in India is defective to a degree that never was surpassed, and very rarely has ever been equalled."

LXXII.

"Indian Records," published by Mr. G. Bubb, 167,
New Bond Street, London. Preface.

"A debate on Indian affairs in the House of Commons is invariably marked with the characteristic feature of 'empty benches' and not unfrequently with what is worse, a 'Count out.'"

"This apathy has led in many instances to the government of India adopting a course of policy which, to Englishmen, lovers of Truth, Justice, and Freedom is abhorrent and would in our individual capacities be shunned equally with a deadly plague; . . and English talent and genius are, we regret to say, too often prostituted in support of the cause of wrong and injustice."

"The great mutiny of 1856—57 was an outbreak entirely due to the now well-known determination of certain powerful Indians no longer to endure the insidious treachery of Indian Government policy, and their fixed resolution to put a stop to, and to revenge the continuous course of accumulated, although almost insensible injuries and encroachments perseveringly carried on against them by the East India Company's officers."

"It has happened that things have been done in the name of Her Majesty as Empress of India which are intolerable in any country subject to British laws, and governed according to British principles of justice."

LXXIII.

Jeynson-Hicks.

"We conquered India by the sword, and by the sword we should continue to hold it—I am not such a hypocrite as to say we hold India for the Indians. We went with a yard stick in one hand and a word in the other, and with the latter we shall continue to hold them helpless while we force the former down their throats."

LXXIV.

John S. Clarke.

"At present Britain stations a huge army in India and behind that protection she swindles the Indian people right and left."

LXXV.

James Caird, Report of the Commission on the
condition of India, 1879.

"We have introduced a system, the first object of which for a foreign Government is necessarily the subjection of the people."

LXXVI.

Frederic Harrison, "National and Social Problems," p. 256.

"In twenty years and more we have sought to make our voices heard when Hindoos were being blown from guns and hunted like wild beasts.

"For a generation we have called out against the military oppression of India."

LXXVII.

William Digby, "Prosperous British India," p. 27.

"The thin whips of the early days of our rule have become bundles of wire thongs; the exactions of Clive and Hastings fall into insignificance by the side of the drain which, in ever-augmenting volume, is over-enriching one country at the loss of the life-blood of another."

LXXVIII.

Major Claude Clerk to Mr. W. Blunt, in a letter dated Nov. 15, 1904.

"... I can see that all you say is as true now as it was then—the impoverishment of the millions, and the reckless extravagance of their effeminate rulers, living away from there in their mountain retreats nine months usually out of the twelve. You may put down much of India's woes to the farce of a government whose officials are perched away in the clouds, absorbed in their own amusements etc., 'in the hills,' and unmindful of their duty to the people."

LXXIX.

H. M. Hyndman, "The Bankruptcy of India," pp. 40—41.

"The life of the Indian has become harder since the English took the country, and will become harder still if we proceed on our present lines. The taxation is already crushing, and it has become more crushing in this present year. We overlook entirely the tremendous economical drain which has been going on for a century owing to a foreign rule, and we neglect to consider that, as land gets poorer, the assessment rises in proportion to the produce. The dangers we have to face are grave indeed; no exaggeration, no forced rhetoric, is needed to increase the weight with which they must press upon us all. There is

evidence enough already and to spare, whilst we are staggering on with our committees and commissions to a catastrophe which, unless facts and figures utterly lie, will be unequalled in the history of the world.

"When poverty-smitten cultivators in one part of India are taxed—permanently taxed—to support famine-stricken ryots in another, who in their turn are to be taxed again for the like service, the whole country being drained all the while by enormous military charges, home charges, interest, remittances, and loss by exchange, it needs no great economist, no far-seeing statesman, to predict that a crash is inevitable. The famines which have been devastating India are in the main *financial famines*. Men and women cannot get food because they have not been able to save the money to buy it. Yet we are driven, so we say, to tax these people more."

LXXX.

Major Wingate, "Our Financial Relations with India," pp. 54—64.

"With reference to its economical effects upon the condition of India, the tribute paid to Great Britain is by far the most objectionable feature in our existing policy. . . . The Indian tribute, whether weighed in the scales of Justice or viewed in the light of our true interest will be found to be at variance with humanity, with common sense, and with the received maxims of economical science.

"Were India to be relieved of this cruel burden of tribute and the whole of the taxes raised in India to be spent in India, the revenue of that country would soon acquire a degree of elasticity of which we have at present no expectation."

LXXXI.

W. S. Blunt, "India under Lord Ripon," pp. 253—54.

"The Government of India, as landlord, does practically nothing for the land. All is squandered and spent on other things, and the people who till the soil are yearly becoming poorer and more hopeless."

Ib., pp. 310—13.

"The Indian Government as at present constituted is a legacy from days when the advantage of the people of India was not even in name the first object with its rulers. Its direct ancestor, the East Indian Company, was a foreign trade corporation, which had got possession of the land, and treated it as a property to be managed for

the exclusive advantage of its members. It was a bureaucracy pure and simple, the most absolute, the closest and the freest of control that the world has ever seen. But in 1858 the Government of India was transferred nominally to the British crown. A royal proclamation gave the people of British India their full status as British subjects, but it has never been carried out, and the principle of Indian Government remains what it has always been—that is to say, *Government in the interests of English trade and English adventure*. . . The English covenanted civilian is the practical owner of India. His position is that of a member of a corporation, irremovable, irresponsible, and amenable to no authority but that of his fellow-members.

"In him is vested all administrative powers. He is, in fact, the Government, and a Government of the most absolute kind."

LXXXII.

East India House, "Observations on the state of Society among Asiatic subjects of Great Britain,"
p. 20, 1792.

"The primary object of Great Britain, let it be acknowledged, was rather to discover what could be obtained from her Asiatic subjects, than how they could be benefitted."

LXXXIII.

Danby Seymour, in "Debates in Parliament on the India question in 1853."

"One might go on for ever quoting in reference to the failings of the East-India Company, for every part of their administration was equally bad."

LXXXIV.

Davis, for many years in high office in Bengal, and a Director.

On the State of Bengal under its native sovereigns.

"I beg it may not be imagined that I in any degree entertain the opinion that Bengal was misgoverned until the English obtained possession of it. The high state of prosperity in which they found it, would, to every unprejudiced mind, sufficiently repel so gross a calumny. For my own part, I not only agree with Mr. Hamilton, in thinking the system under which those effects were produced to be still the system best adopted to the genius and condition of the people, and

that our deviations from it have been attended with inconveniences to the Government, and evils to the people, which go far to countervail any good to either, that can be ascribed exclusively to the change."

In connection with this quotation see also Chapter II Nos. LXVIII and LXIX.

LXXXV.

H. M. Hyndman, "The Bankruptcy of India,"
p. 31.

imp "The East India Company had been, in the main, an economical administrator, and the drain of produce from India to England during the generation prior to its downfall was trifling compared to what it was at the end of the last century, or to what it has been since 1858. Parliamentary misgovernment and Capitalist loans at home, despotic bureaucracy and wholesale Europeanisation in India, have been more harmful by far than all the strange anomalies of the Company's Raj."

LXXXVI.

J. R. Macdonald, "The Awakening of India,"
p. 232.

imp "Up to the present moment the Government has been an autocracy, a despotism. On the governing and administrative authorities representatives of the subject have been in a minority; their powers of criticism have been strictly confined within the narrowest limits; government officials have held the offices which carried real power. Up till now there has been hardly a shadow of self-government in India."

LXXXVII.

H. M. Hyndman, "The Bankruptcy of India,"
p. 157.

"India is very heavily taxed in proportion to its means. Taking the average income per family of five persons at £8, then £2 is taken for the purposes of government."

LXXXVIII.

H. M. Hyndman, "England for all," p. 144.

"But this drain must be staunchd; taxation must be lowered; more Indians must be employed; .. with one accord Sir James Caird,

Mr. Buck, Mr. Harman, and Mr. Robertson, all skilled agriculturists, declare that the soil of India is undergoing steady and permanent deterioration. Mr. Robertson puts the deterioration in Coimbatore at thirty per cent in thirty years, and points out how the people are driven to grow cotton for sale instead of food to eat, and literally to starve themselves in order to pay the Government assessment owing to this deterioration. . . . From all the provinces comes the same sad cry. . . . A deteriorated race of men, an inferior description of bullocks, bear witness to the truth of what they say. . .

"Thus on every side the prospect is gloomy and overcast, and in the opinion of the ablest observers we are drawing nearer and nearer to an almost overwhelming disaster. Year after year we take from India agricultural produce which she cannot spare, because we are the masters of the country, and, paying ourselves handsomely all around, leave those who depend upon us for safety to perish from want. Whilst we are disputing about the defence of the empire—we ourselves are preparing its ruin; the knocking will come through the darkness, from without, the murder within will be done."

LXXXIX.

Sir Archibold R. Colquhoun, "Russia against India,"
pp. 135—36.

"The present condition of affairs undoubtedly renders the struggle for existence a hard one, as may be realized when it is considered that a vast population of India suffers not only from the inevitable droughts which so frequently occur, but *also from a narrow and short-sighted imperial policy which places every obstacle in the way of industrial development and imposes heavy taxes on the struggling people.* According to various authorities Russia's demands upon landowners in her Central Asian possessions are not so exacting as are ours in India, *for the British Government insists on a fifth of the produce, making no allowance for good or bad years; while Russia is said to ask only a tenth and allow for variation of production.*"

XC.

Colonel Briggs in 1830.

"A land tax like that which now exists in India, professing to absorb the whole of the landlord's rent, was never known under any Government in Europe or Asia."

XCI.

J. Keir Hardie, "India, Impressions and Suggestions,
p. 71.

Imp. "One of the glaring injustices in connection with the administration of India is the way in which qualified young Indians are shut out of the higher paid posts in the civil service. Dr. J. Sunderland is responsible for the statement that 8,000 European Anglo-Indian officials draw yearly salaries totalling £13,930,554, whilst 130,000 Native-Indians, also included in the civil service, receive only £3,284,163. If it be alleged that this is due to the superior ability of the European official, then I can only reply that all the facts are against such an assumption."

XCII.

Ib., p. 5.

Imp. "What we have done for education in India is another boast frequently heard. Here, also, so far at least as the older provinces of India are concerned, the boast is ill-founded. The total number of children attending schools in the whole of India, including the Native States, is only about five millions, and the cost which the Government of India spends upon education works out at about 1½d per head!.... Max Müller on the strength of official documents and a missionary report concerning education in Bengal prior to the British occupation, asserts that there were then 80,000 native schools in Bengal, or one for every 400 of the population. Ludlow, in his History of British India, says, that in every Hindoo village which has retained its old form I am assured that the children generally are able to read, write and cipher, but where we have swept away the village system as in Bengal, there the village school also has disappeared. That, I think, disposes effectively of the boast that we are beginning to give education to the people of India."

XCIII.

Ib., p. 71.

Imp. "The Government of India in its present form resembles a huge military despotism tempered somewhat by a civil bureaucracy. Every attempt to win even the smallest modicum of popular rights is regarded by the Olympians who inhabit the heights of Simla (the summer capital of the Government) as a menace to the stability of the Empire."

XCIV.

Ib., p. 83.

"If Native States can provide free compulsory education, including technical training for all their children, can give popular Government, popularly elected councils to the towns and villages, and have a popularly elected *State Assembly*, and generally conduct their business in a way which would bring no discredit to any country in Europe, surely British territory, with all the alleged blessings which British rule and tradition bring should not lag behind. If those parts of India which for over one hundred years have been under British rule are not fit to be trusted with self-government, whilst those Native States which have never been under British rule or which have shaken themselves free from it are governing themselves on democratic lines, and if the people inhabiting the Native States and those in British territory are one and the same, surely this constitutes a sad reflection on British methods."

XCV.

Ib., p. 90.

"... The main concern of the rulers of India is not the improvement of the condition of the people, but the increase of the sources from which revenue can be drawn."

XCVI.

Ib., p. 94.

"As with the peasants, so, too, with the landlords where they exist. They are made to feel in a score of ways that their presence is an offence to a Government which exists for the protection of the people, and so they are subjected to all sorts of imposts and restraints."

XCVII.

Ib., p. 83.

"Such, then, is the Government of India, bureaucratic in form, and, as a consequence, harsh and exacting in all its relations towards the people. To the heads of departments the people of India are but so many seeds in an oil-mill, to be crushed for the oil they yield."

CHAPTER II

EVIDENCE ON THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND ECONOMICAL CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA UNDER THE BRITISH RULE

Condition of India under National Rule.

The people of India, when we subdued them, were ten times as numerous as the Americans whom the Spaniards vanquished, and were at the same time quite as highly civilized as the victorious Spaniards. They had reared cities larger and fairer than Saragossa and Toledo, and buildings more beautiful and costly than the Cathedral of Seville. They could show bankers richer than the richest firms of Barcelona or Cadiz, viceroys whose splendour far surpassed that of Ferdinand the Catholic, myriads of cavalry and long trains of artillery which would have astonished the great Captain.

Lord Macaulay—Life of Clive.

I.

Lord Hastings, former Governor-general of India,
"Parliamentary Papers, East India Affairs," p. 157.

"We seem to have accomplished a revolution in the state of society, which has by some unexpected fatality proved detrimental to general morals, and by no means conducive to the convenience of our Government. Since the first establishment of a zilla Court in the year 1780, and from the regular organisation of them in the year 1793, a new progeny has grown up under our hand, and the principal features which shew themselves in a generation thus formed beneath the shade of our regulations, are a spirit of litigation which our judicial establishments cannot meet, and a morality certainly much deteriorated. If in the system, or the practical execution of it, we should be found to have destroyed the influence of former institutions, without substituting any check in their place . . . we shall be forced to acknowledge that our regulations have been productive of a state of things which imperiously calls on us to provide an immediate remedy for so serious a mischief."

II.

Lord Lawrence, former Viceroy of India.

"The mass of the people of India are so miserably poor that they barely have the means of subsistence, it is as much as a man can do to feed his family or to half feed them, let alone spending money on what you would call luxuries or conveniences."

III.

Sir Thomas Munro, his Life, vol. II, p. 58.

"Our present system of government by excluding all Indians from power, and trust and emolument, is much more effectual in depressing than all our laws and school books can do in elevating their character . . . We can expect to make no progress while we work with a feeble instrument to improve, and a powerful one to deteriorate."

IV.

Sir James Caird, quoted in "New India."

"There is no class on which our rule has pressed harder than upon the native weaver and artisan."

V.

Sir Henry Cotton, "New India," p. 109.

"The economic problem of India is the poverty of her people."

VI.

Ib., pp. 65—66.

"The prosperity of a country has no meaning apart from that of the human beings who are born and dwell in it. To Englishmen the country may mean the soil of India, with all that is above and below it. To Indians it can only mean the people. This theory of identic British interests denotes, no doubt, the advancement of Englishmen, but it does not connote the welfare and happiness of the children of the soil. . . . Indians have learnt by experience that exploitation spells economic serfdom, and that British interests are hostile to their own."

VII.

Sir Edwin Arnold, "Dalhousie's Administration of British India," p. 218.

"But the curse of poverty which we see without relieving, extends far beyond the cotton mills. It blights India, and accuses ourselves."

VIII.

Lord Teignmouth, "Minutes of Evidence (1813)," pp. 2—10.

"I have always observed, that Englishmen are more apt than those of any other nation to commit violences in foreign countries, and this I believe to be the case in India."

IX.

Sir John Malcolm in evidence. Minutes of evidence taken before the select committee 1832. Vol. VI, pp. 30—31.

Q. 278. "In your opinion, was the substitution of our Government for the rule of the Indian princes the cause of greater prosperity to the agricultural and commercial part of the population?"

A. "*I don't think the change has benefitted or could benefit, either the commercial, the monied, or the agricultural classes of many of the Native States, though it may be of others. It has not happened to me ever to*

see countries better cultivated, and so abounding in all produce of the soil, as well as commercial wealth than the Southern Marhatta Districts (under native rule) . . . I don't believe that in that country (central India under native rule) the introduction of our direct rule could have contributed more nor indeed so much, to the prosperity of the commercial and agricultural interests as the establishment of the efficient rule of its former princes and chiefs."

X.

Hon. T. I. Shore, "Notes on Indian affairs," vol. II, p. 28.

"The halcyon days of India are over; she has been drained of a large proportion of the wealth she once possessed; and her energies have been cramped by a sordid system of misrule to which the interests of millions have been sacrificed for the benefit of the few."

XI.

General A. Gordon to Mr. Blunt, "India under Ripon," p. 326.

"You may do what you will. It will be of no use. India will never be reformed until there has been there a new revolt."

XII.

Lord Macaulay, "Historical Essays—Warren Hastings," vol. III.

"Then was seen what we believe to be the most frightful of all spectacles, the strength of civilization without its mercy. To all other despotism there is a check, imperfect indeed, and liable to gross abuse; but still sufficient to preserve society from the last extreme of misery. . . . But against misgovernment such as then (1757—64) afflicted Bengal, it was impossible to struggle. The superior intelligence and energy of the dominant class made their power irresistible."

XIII.

Sir William Hunter, a former member of the Viceroy's Council in 1879 in a speech.

"The Government assessment does not leave enough food to the cultivator to support himself and his family throughout the year."

XIV.

J. Sullivan, in evidence before the Select Committee 1853. Third report of the select committee 1853, pp. 19—20.

Q. 4866. "Do you suppose that they (the people of India) have traditions among them which tell them that the economic condition of the population was better in former times under their native rulers than it is now?"

A. "I think generally speaking, history tells us that it was, they have been in a state of the greatest prosperity from the earliest time, as far as history tells us."

Q. 4890. "You would restore a great deal of territory to native rulers upon principles of justice?"

A. "Yes."

XV.

Sir W. W. Hunter, A speech at Birmingham in 1880.

"There remain forty millions of people in India who go through life on insufficient food."

XVI.

Grierson's statistics summed up by the "Pioneer," a British semi-official paper in India, in 1893.

"Briefly, it is that all persons of the labouring classes, and ten per cent of the cultivating and artisan classes, or *forty-five per cent of the total population* are insufficiently clothed, or insufficiently fed, or both.—It follows that nearly one hundred millions of people in British India are living in extreme poverty."

XVII.

W. Digby, "Prosperous British India," p. 211.

"In India on account of the economic drain and British misrule there are:

- more preventable suffering,
- more hunger,
- more insufficiently clothed bodies,
- more stunted intellects,
- more wasted lives,
- more disappointed men."

XVIII.

Communication to the President of Council, East India Company in the third decade of the eighteenth century.

"It must give pain to an Englishman to have reason to think that, since the Accession of the Company to the Dewanee, the condition of the people of this country has been worse than it was before; and yet I am afraid that fact is undoubted. . . . These appear to me the principal causes why this fine country, which flourished under the most despotic and arbitrary Government, is verging towards its ruin while the English have really so great a share in the Administration."

XIX.

Sir Walter Strickland, "The Black Spot in the East," p. 4.

"To me Ceylon is the island of desolation; when I think of it I feel ashamed of being an Englishman. It is a monument, alone, of the incorrigible selfishness and insatiable greed of the English squatters in Asia, and their 'gouverneurs' who play into their hands, to the detriment of the native population."

XX.

Ib., p. 4.

"What sort of government must that of Ceylon by the English be when, after a century of it, the native population has dwindled to something under three millions?" "It is a horrible thought to reflect that deep down in their heart of hearts the English are glad that three hundred millions of their fellow-subjects in Hindusthan should be half-starved, so that in case of another 'mutiny' they can be massacred by means of repeating rifles and quick firing guns without the fear of any serious casualties on the side of their Christian oppressors."

XXI.

Ib., p. 25.

"It is a horrible thought to reflect that the English acquiesce in the Tamils living half-starved in their own country because their misery there is the fortune of all the jobbing capitalists, sweaters, slave-drivers, syndicates, squatters, mining projectors, rubber- and tea-growers, and all the rest of the pious brigands and devourers of human flesh and blood who swarm throughout the British empire, in a hurry to get rich, make their pile, and carry the fat of the lands they locust to spend elsewhere."

XXII.

Halsey, of Indian civil service. (Official Report).

"I assert that the abject poverty of the cultivator of this district is beyond the belief of any one who has not seen it. He is simply a slave to the soil and to the Government."

XXIII.

W. G. Pedder, of the Indian civil service.
Central Provinces (Official Report).

"The people, if an almost universal consensus of opinion may be relied on, are rapidly going from bad to worse under our rule. . . . The ryot, who paid for them, lay a debtor in the Poona goal; or ate the bitter bread of slavery."

XXIV.

G. Toynbee, C. S. I., former senior member
of the Board of Revenue and a member of the
Viceroy of India's Council.

"The conclusion to be drawn is that of the agricultural population a large proportion, say 40 p. c., are insufficiently fed, to say nothing of clothing and housing. They have enough food to support life and to enable them to work, but they have to undergo long fasts, having for a considerable part of the year to satisfy themselves with one full meal in the day."

XXV.

C. J. O'Donnell, "The failure of Lord Curzon,"
p. 38.

"India is rapidly becoming a land steeped in perennial poverty, and unless some strong and early steps are taken, the English people will find itself face to face with annual famines, due chiefly to the exactions of the State, to the oppression of the poor by the 'Imperialist Empire-BUILDER.'"

XXVI.

Select Committee of the House of Commons
appointed in 1782 to enquire into the administration of justice in India. Ninth Report 1783,
Appendix, p. 120.

"George Smith, Esquire, attending according to order, was asked how long he resided in India, where, and in what capacity. He said

he arrived in India in the year 1764; he resided in Madras from 1767 to October 1779. Being asked what was the state of trade at Madras at the time when he first knew it, he said it was in a flourishing condition, and Madras one of the first marts in India. Being asked in what state did he leave with respect to trade, he replied at the time of his leaving it, there was little or no trade, and but one ship belonging to the place. Being asked in what state the interior country of the Carnatic was with regard to commerce and cultivation when he first knew it, he said, at that period he understood the Carnatic to be in a well-cultivated and populous condition, and as such consuming a great many articles of merchandise and trade. Being asked in what condition it was when he left Madras with respect to cultivation, population, and internal commerce, he said in respect to cultivation, greatly on the decline, and also in respect of population, and as to commerce, exceedingly circumscribed."

XXVII.

Sir Thomas Rumbold, in his "Letter to the Court of Directors dated 15th March 1778.

"It will remain an eternal reproach to the Company's Government in India, that it seems to have been a principle of their policy to drive every Indian of consequence out of their territories. Let any man who has traced the change from the happier days of Bengal and the Circars to their present desolate and deserted state, come forward and explain to the nation, whose name and honour are deeply concerned in the question, what is become of the train of princes, chiefs, and opulent landholders which once covered the face of these countries? . . . It would have been happy for all parties, if the same wise maxims of the former rulers had continued to be respected after the cession of the Circars to the company. The country would have flourished, and the Company would have prospered in the prosperity of their tributaries."

XXVIII.

Sir Thomas Munro, his minute of 31st September 1824, vol. III, pp. 602—632.

"With what grace can we talk of our paternal Government if we exclude them from every important office, and say, as we did till very lately, that in a country (province of Madras) containing fifteen millions of inhabitants, no man but a European shall be entrusted with so much authority as to order the punishment of a single stroke of a rattan. Such an interdiction is to pass a sentence of degradation on a whole

people for which no benefit can ever compensate. There is no instance in the world of so humiliating a sentence having ever been passed upon any nation. . . . We profess to seek their improvement, but propose means the most adverse to success. The advocates of improvement propose to place no confidence in the Indians, to give them no authority, and to exclude them from all office as much as possible. . . .

"It would certainly be more desirable that we should be expelled from the country altogether, than that the result of our system of government should be such a debasement of a whole people."

XXIX.

J. Mill, History of India, Book VI, Chap. VIII.

"Mysore under the Government of Tippoo Sultan, was the best cultivated and its population the most flourishing in India; while under the English and their dependants the population of the Carnatic and Oudh hastening to the state of deserts, was the most wretched upon the face of the earth and even Bengal, under operation of laws ill-adapted to the circumstance of the case, was suffering all the evils which the worst of Governments could inflict."

XXX.

H. Wilson, History of India. India, vol. III, Chap. V.

"The apologists for the conquests of 1826 from Burma admit that the provinces it was deemed advisable to exact from Ava were, at the time of their cession, of little value; and they particularly observe, that far from being hailed as deliverers, *our advent was followed by the disappearance of the whole of the population.*"

XXXI.

1b.

"If we make a summary comparison of the advantages and disadvantages which have occurred to the people of India from our Government, the result, I fear, will hardly be so much in its favour as it ought have been. . . . They have no share in making laws for themselves, little in administering them, except in very subordinate offices; they can rise to no high station, civil or military; they are more often regarded as vassals or servants than as the ancient owners and masters of the country. . . . One of the greatest disadvantages of our Government in India is its tendency to lower or destroy the higher ranks of society."

XXXII.

Dr. Buchanan's account of Gorakpur quoted in
Montgomery Martin's "History of Eastern India,"
vol. II, p. 547—549.

"It is indeed said, that during the Government of Suja-ud-dowla the district of Gorakpur, was in a much better state than at present, and that the rents having been farmed to Colonel Hanny that gentleman took such violent measures in the collection as to depopulate the country, and I certainly perceive many traces of cultivation where now there are wastes and woods."

XXXIII.

Dr. Buchanan's Journey from Madras, vol. II, p. 388.

"The territory of the Raja of Cochin is so far better administered than that more fully under the authority of the company that neither Moplas nor Nairs presume to make any disturbance."

XXXIV. ✓

ib., p. 388.

"With all the blessing which it conferred, the Company's administration committed the fatal blunder of overassessing the soil; and the condition of the people under the Company's rule was therefore one of hopeless poverty."

XXXV. ✓

W. M. Torrens, M. P., "Empire in Asia," p. 392.

"A century of misrule has ended in a convulsion so terrible that the best and bravest natures shuddered at its contemplation, and the wisest and ablest servants of the state were those who said the least about it. The whole of the dreadful truth has never yet been spoken—will never probably be spoken in our time."

XXXVI.

ib., p. 408.

"Meanwhile, what is the condition of the mass of the people? By the confession of the latest authority, they are reduced to the lowest point at which existence can be maintained. Penury, with all its attendant privations, when the season is good, and pinching want bordering on destitution when the season is bad, are the only alternatives of the ryot's lot."

XXXVII.

ib., p. 412.

"Misrule cannot exist without an overgrown army, and wasteful military expenditure cannot live but by misrule. From first to last the policy of conquest and confiscation has implied and required not only an amount of force which good government would not have wanted, but an amount of jobbing, under the pretence and name of military expenditure, which good government would under no circumstances have needed or allowed. Wholly apart from the enormous drain upon the profits of Indian industry in the form of emoluments hoarded and husbanded for private use at home, the resources of the country have systematically been exhausted for the pay and keep of an excessive military establishment, of which a great portion has at all times been European."

XXXVIII.

John Bright Esq., in "Debates in Parliament on the India question" in 1853.

"If a country were found possessing a most fertile soil, and capable of bearing every variety of production, and that, notwithstanding, the people were in state of extreme destitution and suffering, the chances were that there was some *fundamental error* in the government of that country."

XXXIX.

Phillimore, in "Debates in Parliament in the India question in 1853."

"Under the native rule property and liberty were safe, robberies unheard of, whether public or private, . . . that once happy country at this moment is one dead level of uniform misery, in which all are involved alike; and in the richest country in the world, from the conduct of the Government the House was asked to support, he defied anyone to point out a rich resident proprietor."

XL.

Mr. W. T. Thornton, "The Indian Tribute," pp. 78—79 and 92—93.

"It is established there is a drain from India to England. What is its nature and extent? . . . It is India's tribute which is so balefully weighing down the Indian exchange, and that the same burden threatens, unless speedily and materially lightened, to break the Indian camel's back, miracle of endurance though the animal be."

XLI.

W. C. Bennet in "Oude Gazetteer," vol. I, p. 515.

"It is not till he has gone into these subjects in detail that a man can fully appreciate how terribly thin the line is which divides large masses of people from absolute nakedness and starvation."

XLII.

General A. G. Gordon, "Letters of General A. C. Gordon to his sister," p. 208.

"India is the most wretched of countries. The way Europeans live there is absurd in its luxury. . . . I declare I think we are not far off losing it."

XLIII.

A. K. Connell, Paper on "Indian Pauperism, Free Trade, and Railways," March 1884.

"Historians, whose ideas have been largely coloured by those of the governing classes, have depicted in strong colours the short-lived horrors of a popular revolution, but the permanent sufferings caused by a governmental revolution have been for the most part sketched with faint sketches. And yet the latter type of revolution leads to more disastrous consequences than the former. If India is to escape such a catastrophe, it can only do so by the Indian Government and the British Parliament showing more consideration than hitherto for native wants and ways. It is not more science, but more sympathy that is demanded of us by an ancient civilization like that of India. . . . Wherever we have superseded, wherever we have poisoned the social organism with English reforms, instead of purifying it by the light of the best native tradition, there the seeds of demoralization and disaster have been sown broadcast."

XLIV.

Bishop Heber's Journal, vol. II, p. 361.

"The population (of Bhurutpur State) did not seem great but the villages which we saw; . . . afforded so pleasing a picture of industry, and was so much superior to anything which I have been led to expect in Rajputana, or which I had seen in the Company's territories, that I was led to suppose . . . that either the Rajah of Bhurutpur was an extremely kind and parental Governor or that the system of management adopted in the British provinces was in some way or other less favourable to the improvement and the happiness of the country than that of some of the Native States."

✓
XLV.

H. M. Hyndman, "The Bankruptcy of India,"
p. 194.

"I have written to very little purpose if I have not by this time convinced all unprejudiced readers that the present state of our Indian Empire is so dangerous, that it is the bounden duty of Englishmen of all classes to look carefully into the facts. It is impossible to put aside Lord Lawrence, Lord Canning, Lord Ripon, Sir James Caird, Mr. James Geddes, Mr. Robertson etc., as so many ignorant or prejudiced persons. Yet all of them have given it as their opinion that *India is a very poor country*, and that we ought greatly to increase the employment of Indians as well as to practise the most relentless economy in every department."

XLVI.

"Moral and Material progress of India," 1874—75.

"The Calcutta missionary conference dwelt on the miserable; abject condition of the Bengal ryots, and there is evidence that they suffer many things and are often in want of absolute necessities. In the North-Western Provinces the wages of agricultural labour have hardly varied at all since the early part of this century; . . . many live on coarse grain, which is unwholesome, and produces loin palsy. This extreme poverty among the agricultural population is one of the reasons which makes any improvement in farming and cultivation so difficult."

XLVII.

H. Russell in evidence before the House of Commons Committee 1852, vol. VI, p. 445.

"But no consequence perhaps of the introduction of our system has been more prejudicial than the utter extinction it has occasioned of the upper classes of society among the Indian people. . . . Every avenue to creditable employment is closed against them, and whether in civil or military service, they are equally excluded from distinction."

XLVIII. ✓

W. S. Blunt, "India under Ripon," p. 232.

"India's famines have been severer and more, its agricultural poverty has deepened, its rural population has become more hopelessly in debt, their despair more desperate. The system of constantly en-

hancing the land revenue has not been altered. The salt tax, though slightly lowered, still robs the very poor. Hunger and those pestilences which are the result of hunger, are spread over an increasing, not a diminishing, area. The Deccan ryot is still perhaps the poorest peasant in the world. Nothing of the system of finance is changed, nothing in the economy which favours English trade and English speculation at the expense of India's native industries. What was bad twenty-five years ago is worse now. At any rate there is the same drain of India's food to alien moutns. Endemic famine and endemic plague, are facts no official statistics of prosperity can explain away."

XLIX.

Hon. A. A. Roberts, C. B. C. S. I. Judicial Commissioner, Punjab, "Correspondence regarding British and Native Administration in India,"
p. 112.

"The masses—the tenants, and farm-labourers, artisans, domestic servants, and others,—earn, no more in British territory than elsewhere, nought but a bare subsistence for themselves and their families. . . . I doubt, whether the masses are so prosperous as they were before the mutiny, or as they used to be under the Native Government."

L.

Buchanan's Journey from Madras etc., vol. II,
p. 296.

"Mr. Hurdis thinks that present rents are greatly too high; and no doubt, the peasantry here, as well as in almost every part of India, are miserably poor."

LI.

H. M. Hyndman, "The Bankruptcy of India,"
pp. 116—17.

"That famines are becoming more frequent and more fatal, that taxation has reached its limit, that the revenue is inelastic and the expenditure period for period steadily increasing; that the production of the soil over large areas is lessening, and the margin of food above the limit of starvation being greatly reduced, are hard facts no longer to be put contemptuously aside as the idle fancies of so-called pessimists.—*They are the well-weighed conclusions of a special famine commissioner* convinced against his will, the accepted truths of the English Government which felt but now assured that India was rejoicing in the fullest prosperity."

LII. ✓

Ib., p. 152.

"India is becoming feebler and feebler. The very life-blood of the great multitude under our rule is slowly, yet ever faster, ebbing away."

LIII. ✓

Ib., p. 39.

"Where is the wealth of India? The cultivators clearly have not got it, for they, as is generally admitted, can scarcely support the pressure of the present taxation, . . . Indian investments are almost unknown. Barely a fraction of the enormous debt is held by Indians; the capital for the railroads and irrigation works has all been borrowed in England, . . . and the native manufactures which have been ruined by our cheaper goods, are not yet, at any rate, replaced by new industries.

"The wealth of Indian bankers and capitalists is on paper only—in brief, it is lent to their more needy countrymen. It represents the capital required for the agriculture of the millions of small farmers. If we trace downwards and downwards the wealth of the million banker, we shall find it at last in thousands of miserable bullocks and such like investments, the working stock of a numerous but very poor people."

LIV.

Samuel Smith, M. P., in a "Speech in the House of Commons in August 1894."

"Only one man in seven hundred in India comes within the category of £50 a year. I will make a further statement. The right honorable gentleman is well aware that in this country one penny in the income-tax yields £2,000,000 sterling. In India it yields considerably less than £200,000. India contains 220,000,000 of people under British rule. The people yield on the income-tax less than one-tenth of what 38,000,000 yield in the united kingdom. The meaning of that is that every million of the people in India yield just one-sixtieth of what a similar number yield in this country. If this is not conclusive of the poverty of the people, nothing will satisfy the most exacting mind."

LV. ✓

Rev. I. Knowles, London Missionary Society, Southern India, in a "Letter to the Manchester Guardian" in 1890.

"In my own missionary experience I once carefully investigated the earnings of a congregation of 300, and found the average amounted

to less than a farthing a head per day. They did not live, they eked out an existence. I have been in huts where the people were living on carrion. I have taken photographs of famine groups which are enough for most people; yet in all these cases there was no (official) recognized famine."

LVI. ✓

William Digby, "Prosperous British India,"
pp. 121—22.

"My observations in Indian famines must be general in their character rather than exhaustive. There is no need for an exhaustive treatment in these pages. A small library of books has already been published on the subject. I shall simply show that India, under British rule, *has become* (the reader, will please, in his reading, carefully note and emphasise the word) *chronically famine-stricken*, and shall furnish some particulars, from official sources, which indicate that the famines of the past twenty years might have been prevented if the course which was strongly recommended to the Indian authorities by the famine-commission on 1880, had been adopted. Following from these statements is the deduction—of the truth and accuracy of which, sorrowfully, I am fully convinced that famines in India, under our enlightened and all-embracing rule, are the direct result of our *neglect as rulers to do the right thing*, at the right time, in the right way."

LVII.

Ib., p. 130.

"Official figures show over one million deaths on the average per annum during the past ten years, or, two British subjects passed away from starvation or starvation-induced diseases every minute of every day and every night from January 1, 1889, to September 30, 1901!"

LVIII.

Ib., p. 140.

"Why is it that India is more liable to devastation by famine than are other countries?—*Because India is steadily and rapidly growing poorer.*"

LIX. ✓

Wilfried Scawen Blunt, "India under Ripon,"
pp. 236—38.

"No one accustomed to Eastern travel can fail to see how poor the Indian peasant is. Travelling by either of the great lines of railways

which bisect the continent, one need hardly leave one's carriage to be aware of this. . . . Nor is the aspect of poverty less startling if one looks closer. . . . In every village I heard of complaints of over-taxation of the country, of increase and inequalities of assessment, complaints of the forest laws, of the decrease of the stock of working cattle, of their deterioration through the price of salt. The special evils which we have imposed upon the Indian tax-payer are, however, only too apparent. . . . British India under the modern system is a striking instance of the evils of absentee ownership. For the last hundred years it has been the constant aim of the Madras government to destroy all ownership in land but its own."

LX. ✓

J. R. Macdonald, "The Awakening of India,"
p. 159.

"Sir William Hunter said that 40,000,000 Indians go through life with insufficient food; Sir Charles Elliot estimated that one-half of the agricultural population never satisfied hunger fully from one year's end to another. From thirty to fifty millions families live in India on an income which does not exceed $3\frac{1}{2}d$ per day. *The poverty of India is not an opinion, it is a fact.*"

LXI.

William Digby, "India for the Indians—and for England," p. 260.

"England in India is sowing bad seed; India, not England, is reaping the necessarily bad crop. So strong is England, so weak is India, but the laws of nature are defied and over-ruled. For a hundred years this has happened, each year recording an increasing British strength and a corresponding Indian weakening."

LXII.

John Briggs, "The present land tax in India,"
pp. 349—416.

"The flourishing condition of the country under the Moghal Emperors is recorded by all the European travellers who have visited the East within the last three centuries; and the wealth of the population, and the national prosperity of India, far surpassing what they had seen in Europe filled them with astonishment. That the condition of the people and the country under our Government presents no such spectacle, is every day proclaimed by ourselves, and we may therefore assume it to be true. . . ."

"I conscientiously believe that under no Government whatever, Hindu or Mahommedan, professing to be actuated by law, was any system so subversive of the prosperity of the people at large as that which has marked our administration. . . .

"Although we have everywhere confessed that the heavy pressure of taxation was the most cruel injury they sustained, we have in no instance alleviated that pressure. So far from it, we have applied a false measure for fixing the impost, that of money instead of produce; we have pretended to abolish minor taxes on other classes, but have laid the amount on the landholder, . . . and in many instances deprived the cultivators of the means they enjoyed of paying the heavy taxes from which they sought relief under us, till by rigid exactions, we have increased our own revenue and reduced the people to the condition of mere labourers. This is the professed maxim of our rule, the certain and inevitable result of taking the whole surplus profit of land."

LXIII.

Montgomery Martin, "History of Eastern India, vol. III, Introduction (1838)."

"Since the official report (Dr. Buchanan's economic inquiries in Northern India) was made to Government, have any effective steps been taken in England or in India to benefit the sufferers by our rapacity and selfishness? None! On the contrary, we have done everything possible to impoverish still further the miserable beings subject to the cruel selfishness of English commerce."

LXIV.

A. H. Harington, commissioner of Fyzabad in "An enquiry into the economic condition of the Agricultural and labouring classes in the north western Provinces and Oudh, 1888."

The same authority (W. Bennet) remarks: "It is not till he has gone into these subjects in detail that a man can fully appreciate how terribly thin the line is which divides large masses of people from absolute nakedness and starvation. I believe that this remark is true in every district of Oudh, the difference between them consisting in the great or small extent of the always large proportion which is permanently in this depressed and dangerous condition. . . .

"I quote the following passage from some papers contributed by me to the Pioneer under the head of 'Oudh affairs in 1876.' It has been calculated that about 60 per cent of the entire native popula-

tion . . . are sunk in such abject poverty, that unless the small earnings of child labour are added to the same general stock by which the family is kept alive, some members of the family would starve.

"On the question, then, whether the impression that the greater proportion of the people of India suffer from a daily insufficiency of food is wholly untrue. . . . My own belief, after a good deal of study of the closely connected question of agricultural indebtedness (vide my five chapters on Economic Reform in Rural India in the Calcutta Review, 1882—85), is that the impression is perfectly true as regards a varying, but always considerable part of the year in the greater part of India."

LXV.

A. I. Lawrence C. I. E., commissioner of Allahabad.

"I believe there is very little difference between poorer classes of the people and semi-starvation; but what is the remedy?"

LXVI.

W. S. Blunt, "India under Ripon," pp. 201—3.

"With regard to the material prosperity of the people of the Native States, as compared with British India, I can only speak of what I have seen. The territories of the Indian princes are for the most part not the most fertile tracts of India; and one cannot avoid a suspicion that their comparative poverty has been the cause of their continued immunity from annexation. . . . Poor land compared with poor land I think the comparison would not be unfavourable to the Native States. I was certainly struck in passing from the British Deccan below Raichore into the Nizam's Deccan with certain signs of the better condition in the latter. . . . The Rajput State of Ulwar, where I also made some inquiries, was represented to me as being considerably more favourably assessed than British Rajputana. . . . With regard to the town population, I found the few independent native capitals which I visited exhibiting signs of well-being in the inhabitants absent in places of the same calibre under British rule."

LXVII.

Meredith Townsend, "Asia and Europe."

"It is the active classes who have to be considered and to them our rule is not, and cannot be, a rule without a prodigious drawbacks. One of these, of which they are fully conscious, is the gradual decay

of much of which they were proud, the slow death, which even the Europeans perceive, of Indian art, Indian culture, Indian military spirit. . . . And the last and greatest one of all is the total loss of the interestingness of life.

"It would be hard to explain to the average Englishman how interesting Indian life must have been before our advent, how completely open was every career to the bold, the enterprising, or the ambitious. . . . For all this which we have extinguished we offer nothing in return, nor can we offer anything. . . . I firmly believe that to the immense majority of the active classes of India the old time was a happy time."

LXVIII.

Lord Cornwallis, Governor General of India, "Extract from his minute, 2nd August, 1789."

State of Bengal after twenty years of British Rule.

"I am sorry to be obliged to say, that the agricultural and internal commerce have for many years been gradually declining, and that at present, excepting the class of Shroffs and Bunyas, who reside almost entirely in great towns, the inhabitants of these provinces were advancing hastily to a general state of poverty and wretchedness."

LXIX.

"Friend of India," an English paper formerly published in India, April 1, 1852.

Present Condition of the Agricultural Population of Bengal.

"No one has ever attempted to contradict the fact that the condition of the Bengal peasantry is almost as wretched and degraded as it is possible to conceive, The Bengal ryot knows nothing of the most ordinary comforts of life. We speak without exaggeration when we affirm, that if the real condition of these who raise the harvest, which yields between three and four millions a year, was fully known it would make the ears of one who heard thereof tingle."

LXX.

Sir John Malcolm on "State of Malwa," quoted in "A plea for the native princes," p. 99—100.

"... I had ample means afforded to me, as the person appointed to occupy that territory, and to conduct its civil, military and politi-

cal administration, to learn all that the records of Government could teach, and to obtain from other sources full information of this country; . . . I don't believe that in this country the introduction of our direct rule could have contributed more, nor indeed so much, to the prosperity of the commercial and agricultural interests, as the *re-establishment of the efficient rule of its former princes and chiefs*, who, protected from attack, are quite free in their internal administration from our interference."

LXXI.

Ib. on "Southern Marhatta Districts," p. 100.

"With respect to the Southern Marhatta Districts, of whose prosperity I have before spoken, if I refer, as I must, to their condition before the last few years of Bajee Row's misrule, I don't think that either their commercial or agricultural interests are likely to be improved under our rule, . . . I must unhesitatingly state, that the provinces belonging to the family of 'Patwardhan,' and some other chiefs on the banks of the Krishna present a greater agricultural and commercial prosperity than almost any I know in India. I refer this to their system of administration which, though there may be at periods exactions, is, on the whole mild and paternal. . . . If these men exact money at times in an arbitrary manner all their expenditure, as well as all they receive, is limited to their own provinces; but, above all causes which promote prosperity, is the invariable support given to the village and other native institutions, and to the employment, far beyond what our system admits, of all classes of the population."

LXXII.

Sir William Denison, acting Governor-General
in 1864.

"The more I see of the state of things in this, the more earnestly do I wish for alterations and reform; yet the growth of abuses has been so natural and so gradual, each step having been almost a necessary consequence of the preceding one, that it is difficult to know where one is to stop. Many matters come before me which involve a consideration of the treatment dealt out by us to the great men of the land in former times, and which impress me with the conviction that we acted towards them most nefariously; but were I to attempt to grant redress to the children of these, where could I stop?"

LXXIII.

J. Keir Hardie, "India, Impressions and Suggestions,"
pp. 1—2.

"We hear less now-a-days about India's great wealth or about the great fortunes which merchant princes have been able to accumulate there, but at no period of India's history has there ever been such a regular *soaking drain* upon its people as *now*. It is calculated that the British capital invested in India in railways, irrigation schemes, public works, and undertakings of various kinds amounts to £500,000,000. That, of itself, at 5 per cent interest, represents a burden upon India of £25,000,000 sterling a year. By a burden I mean that the interest is paid to bondholders in this country and is not, therefore, benefitting the people from whom it is taken. Then, in addition, there are civil and military pensions and other items, so that the estimate of £30,000,000 a year made by Mr. A. J. Wilson, of the *Investor's Review*, is certainly well within the mark. Eighty per cent of the taxes in India are raised by revenue assessment upon land The amount of taxes raised direct from the peasant is from 50 per cent to 65 per cent of the value of the yield of the land, in addition to which they have to pay local cesses and various other small items, so that no less than 75 per cent of the harvest goes in taxes. To most people this will seem incomprehensible. A 5 per cent tax on income at home (England) leads to heavy and continuous grumbling, and yet the 5 per cent is assessed not on the total produce of the land, but on the profits. What then must be the condition of a country in which the tax is not 5 per cent on the profits, but 75 per cent on the harvest reaped? From time to time the revenue charges are revised so that the Government may obtain the last penny which can be wrung from the overweighted peasant. Increases of 30 per cent are common and there are many on record of 50, 70 and even 100 per cent. It is this fact which keeps the people of India in a condition of *perpetual hopeless, grinding poverty*."

LXXIV.

Ib., pp. 3—4.

"The outcome of this extortion is that the people are reduced to such a condition of abject destitution as is probably not to be equalled in any other country in the world, and certainly not in one which for a hundred years has been under civilized rule. Sir William Hunter, who was Director-General of Indian Statistics, put it on record that forty millions of the people never at any time had enough to eat; and Mr. S. S. Thorburn, financial commissioner of the Punjab, declared that 'seventy

millions of Indian peasants are in such a condition of hopeless poverty that no reform can do them any good!' Testimony of a similar kind could be multiplied indefinitely. In further support of this contention I will quote the name of three living authorities, neither of whom will be accused of having undue sympathy with the Indians. In 1882 Lord Cromer, as he is now, declared that the national income of India worked out at 36s per head of the population. Lord George Hamilton, in 1894, whilst he was Secretary of State for India, gave the average at £2, and this was endorsed by Lord Curzon, who, in reply to some figures showing a lower estimate, proudly declared that the income of the peasantry averaged £1 65·8d per head per annum. Other estimates, only quasi-official, put the income of the peasant as low as 125·6d per head. As showing what this means, I may note in Great Britain the average income is £42 per head, and that even in agricultural Russia it is £11.—. These figures speak for themselves."

LXXV.

Ib., p. 87.

"In forty years (1860—1900) thirty millions (30,000,000) of people died of hunger in India—that, too, under the benign rule of the British Raj. What number died of disease in the same period will never be known, but all are agreed that the plague is now persisting and continuing in a way and manner hitherto unknown, and I believe the cause to be *the growing poverty of the people.*"

LXXVI. ✓

Ib., p. 90.

4770 "I conclude then, that there is abundant evidence to justify the belief that the condition of the Indian peasant *has worsened* under British rule He finds his poverty deepening and the burden of life pressing with increasing weight upon him, and not only is he without means of resistance, but he has no organ through which he can voice his woes

"Plague, then, is in the main due to hunger, and that is a condition of things for which our system of governing India must be held directly responsible."

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS

WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH
DAY AND TO \$1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY
OVERDUE.

APR 13 1934

NOV 19 1940

8 Jan '56 VW

REC'D LD


JUN 21 1957

16 Mar '61 DA
REC'D LD

MAR 8 1961

NOV 19 1965 94
REC'D LD

OCT 27 '65 - 7 PM



OM

TC

PROBES
THE FIDELITY OF DEATH
A NOVEL